



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VIII.—THE SOURCE OF THE SO-CALLED ACHAEAN-DORIC KOINĒ.

It is an established fact in the history of the Greek dialects that the complete supremacy of the Attic *κοινή* was for a time retarded by the spread in Western Greece, under the influence of the Aetolian and Achaean leagues, of another *κοινή*, now commonly known as the Achaean-Doric *κοινή*. So, for example, Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*³, p. 22, after Meister and others. The thesis which this brief paper attempts to establish is that even this *κοινή* is an indirect witness to the influence of the Attic *κοινή*, for, although based in the main upon the dialects of the Northwest Greek group, it is in a measure an artificial product for which the Attic *κοινή* has furnished not only the suggestion, but also certain specific elements.

Although certain forms in late inscriptions of various Peloponnesian dialects had already been attributed to the influence of the Aetolian league (cf., for example, Cauer, *Delectus*, Nos. 30, 462, with notes, Smyth, *Dialects of North Greece*, pp. 13 ff.), it was Meister who, in his classification of the Arcadian inscriptions (*Gr. Dial. II*, pp. 81 ff.), called attention somewhat more specifically to this element, and gave it the name which has gained considerable currency, the Achaean-Doric *κοινή*. This dialect, he remarks, is the same as that spoken in Phthiotis, Epirus, Acarnania, Aetolia and Phocis, the same which formed the basis of all Doric dialects. But this is only another way of stating that the same *κοινή* appears in the inscriptions of the countries named, dating from the 3d and 2d centuries B. C., and that it possesses many peculiarities common to all Doric dialects; the question of its real origin is not answered thereby. Of the dialects originally spoken in these districts, the only one of which we have any knowledge is the Phocian, and this Old Phocian is something quite different from the later *κοινή*. The dialect of Locris, not included in the districts named by Meister, is the only other Northwest Greek dialect known in its purity, and this again is different. For the others we must agree with Blass: "Es kann weder der dorische Dialekt des Aetolischen Bundes als echt aetolisch gelten,

noch ist der Dialekt der akarnanischen Inschriften etwas anderes als der importierte korinthische.¹ Ebenso verhält es mit Epeirus."

But, one may say, if we have no direct knowledge of the Old Aetolian, is it not at least possible that it was just the dialect which appears in the later κοινή? I think not. There are certain elements in the latter which we can not believe to have existed in Old Aetolian,—for example, the conjunction *εἰ*, which, barring late inscriptions, is not found outside of Attic-Ionic and Arcadian. We may be sure that Old Aetolian inscriptions, if we had them, would show *αι* like Locrian, Phocian, Boeotian and Thessalian, not to speak of the Doric dialects of the Peloponnesus. We are driven to the conclusion that the Ach.-Dor. κοινή does not represent any one of the Northwest Greek dialects in its purity, but even in its earliest appearance bears witness to some external influence. This influence can only be that of the Attic κοινή, which was at the same period affecting to a greater or less degree the dialects of other parts of Greece. So, for example, at Delphi. It has been commonly assumed that the difference between the language of the old inscriptions and that of the manumission decrees was due to the Aetolian influence. But the newly discovered temple-accounts (Bull. corr. hell., '96, 197 ff. = Collitz, No. 2502), dating from the time of Alexander the Great, show that before the Aetolians set foot in Delphi the local dialect was losing its purity and showing an admixture of Attic forms. This inscription has, for example, the personal ending *-μεν* beside the native *-μες*, dat. plur. *-σι* beside the 'Aeolic' *-εσσι* (*ιερομνάμοσι* beside *πρυτανίεσσι*), *εἴκοσι* beside *ἑκατι*, *εἰς* in place of *ἐν* cum acc., *ὀβολός* in place of *ὀδελός*, once gen. sg. in *-εως*, etc. Similarly the modified form of Doric seen in late inscriptions of various Doric islands of the Aegean is clearly due to the influence of the Attic κοινή.

Among examples of Attic forms in the Ach.-Dor. κοινή may be mentioned:

1. The universal use of *εἰ* in place of *αι*.
2. The use of *πρῶτος* in place of *πᾶτος*, e. g. in Collitz, Nos. 1461 (Phthiotis), 1529 (Phocis), 1614 (Achaëa). Meister gives *πᾶτος* as the Ach.-Dor. form. The occasional appearance of the gen-

¹ This is true of the tomb-inscription found in the north of Acarnania (CIG. 1794 h, Roberts 106), which shows the Corinthian alphabet and the kind of Doric epic that one meets in the early inscriptions of Corcyra. An inscription of Stratos, of the early 4th century, is in the Ionic alphabet and shows possible Attic influence. Cf. Bechtel, *Hermes*, 31, 318.

uine Doric form would not be surprising, but I have no citation for this.

3. The prevalence of *οἱ* over *τοί*. The latter is the only form in Old Phocian, Locrian, Boeotian and the Doric dialects of the Peloponnesus. Nearly all the Aetolian and Achaean inscr. show *οἱ*, though the late Delphian retains the *τοί* with more persistency (but *οἱ* also frequent; sometimes *τοί* and *οἱ* in same inscr., e. g. Collitz, 1707).

4. The prevalence of *ιερός* over *ιαρός*, though both are found. The genuine Northwest Greek form was certainly *ιαρός*, as in Old Phocian (Collitz, 2501, inscribed at Athens, has *ιαρός*, *ιαρώ*, but also *ιερομνάμονες* beside *ιαρομνάμονες*, and *ιερομηνία*. These forms in *ιερο-* are probably due to Attic influence, as it is unlikely that the pure Phocian used both *ιαρό-* and *ιερό-*), Boeotian, Elean and the Doric dialects.

5. The frequency of *εἰς* beside *ἐν* cum acc., sometimes on the same inscription, e. g. Collitz, 1411, 1415. In general *ἐν* is more common than *εἰς* in Northern Greece, but in Achaean inscriptions it is not found. The difference may be accounted for by the assumption that the genuine Achaean form was never *ἐν*, as in Northwest Greek and Elean, but *εἰς* (less probably *εἰς*), as in Peloponnesian Doric. This is borne out by the contrast of Achaean *ἕστε* 'until' (Collitz, 1615) with Northwest Greek *ἕντε*.

6. The occasional appearance of *εἶναι* and *πρός*. These are included by Meister in his list of Ach.-Dor. characteristics (l. c., pp. 82-3), but they are far less common than *εἶμεν* and *ποτὶ*, and so belong to what may be called a second stratum of Attic.

7. To this stratum of later or occasional Atticisms belong: genitives like *βασιλείως* (Collitz, 1416-17), *πόλειως* (Collitz, 4576, Laconia); forms with *ττ* as *θάλαττα* (Collitz, 1410, 1636), *τέτταρες* (*τεττάρους* with Aetolian dative, Collitz, 1539, Phocis); *ἐάν* (e. g. Collitz, 1634, which also has *εἴ κα*); *ἕως ἄν* (Collitz, 1545, Phocis; 4516, Laconia, etc.); imperat. *ῥντων*, part. *ῥν* (e. g. Collitz, 1410; on Delphian manumission decrees *ῥν* and *ἑών* are used indiscriminately, e. g. 1757); imperat. *-τωσαν*; *εἴκοσι*, etc., etc.

Hitherto we have not questioned the propriety of regarding all that goes under the name of Achaean-Doric as a single *κοινή*. Yet the language is far from uniform. Not only are there widely different degrees in the amount of Attic influence shown (contrast, for example, the semi-Attic *εἴ κα* with the wholly Attic *ἐάν*), but, aside from this, the groundwork is not quite the same in

the dialect spread through Aetolian and that spread through Achaean influence. Only the former has *ἐν* cum acc. and the dative plural of consonant stems in *-οις* (*φερόντοισ*, etc.). It would be better, then, to distinguish the Aetolian *κοινή* and the Achaean *κοινή*. It must be remembered also that Attic influence shows itself more or less in nearly all Doric dialects, from the 4th century on, and, except for the specific Aetolian features just mentioned, the result is not essentially different.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, *July*, 1900.

CARL DARLING BUCK.